

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10, and 12 are pending.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins, U.S. Patent No. 2,116,370, in view of Wilkins, U.S. Patent No. 5,040,856, and Becker, U.S. Patent No. 5,975,663. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Watkins discloses all of the claimed features of independent claim 1 except that Watkins fails “to teach at least one support frame in the shape of an inverted ‘(L)’; and wherein, when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and blocks access from the outside of the door to the hinge connection. The Office Action then asserts that Wilkins and Becker disclose such features, and concludes that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include flanges along the upper edge of the support frame of Watkins, as taught by Wilkins, in order to provide structural reinforcement thereto; and to modify the size and shape of the cover bracket of Watkins to shield the hinge connection thereof, as taught by Becker in order to improve the aesthetic appearance and safety of said structure, and to prevent extraneous matter from interfering with said hinge connection, thereby providing the structure substantially as claimed.”

However, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, at least one support frame in the shape of an inverted “L” hingedly connected at a lower end to a rear surface of the door thereby creating a hinge connection to allow the door to pivot about the lower end of the door and allow a storage box for storing an object to be seated behind the door. The Examiner refers to element 7

of Watkins as corresponding to the claimed at least one support frame. However, element 7 is disclosed as a sidewall. Door 17 is hingedly connected to a forward edge of drawer bottom 8 of the drawer 3 via hinge plates 14 and hinge pins 16. See page 2, col. 1, lines 7-21 of Watkins. Further, Wilkins discloses a door 12 having sidewalls 28 and 30 as well as an outwardly directed flange 146 at an upper portion of the respective sidewalls having a downwardly turned lip 148, the flange 146 with lip 148 forming a drawer track channel means 144, which cooperates with track rollers 140, 142. See Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 5-39 of Wilkins. The sidewalls 28, 30 with flange 146 configured to form channel means 144 for track rollers 140, 142 in no way would have suggested at least one support frame in the shape of an inverted L hingedly connected at a lower end to a rear surface of the door thereby creating a hinge connection to allow a door to pivot about the lower end of the door and allow a storage box for storing an object to be seated behind the door. Thus, neither Watkins nor Wilkins, taken alone or in combinations, disclose or suggest the claimed at least one support frame.

Independent claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*, at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door at a position adjacent to and outward of the at least one support frame and hinge connection, wherein when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection. The Examiner refers to element 111 of Becker as a cover bracket positioned and shaped to shield element 40, which the Examiner refers to as the hinge connection, and block access from outside of the door 18 to said hinge connection.

However, although element 111 is referred as a cover member, it is clearly part of the hinge connection for door 18. Further, element 111 does not protrude backward from the rear surface of the door 18 at a position adjacent to and outward of at least one support frame and hinge connection. Rather, it is attached to refrigerator top wall 8 and upper hinge assembly 21 by fastener 148. See Fig. 2 of Becker. Thus, neither Watkins nor Becker, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed at least one cover bracket.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 4, 6, and 12 are allowable over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker, further in view of Jenkins, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,239.

Dependent claim 3 is allowable over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Jenkins fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker, as Jenkins is merely cited for allegedly teaching a door basket. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 3 over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Meck, U.S. Patent No. 2,711,944, in view of Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 10 is allowable over Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Meek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker, as Meek is merely cited for disclosing a refrigerator. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 10 over Meek, Watkins, Wilkins, and Becker, should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 10/801,565
Reply to Office Action of February 19, 2008

Docket No. IK-0084

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Drizbick
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3777 CLD:tlg
Date: May 15, 2008
\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-083\155085.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610